UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,476	07/17/2006	Wolfgang Bauer	U 016385-8	5872
140 LADAS & PAF	7590 07/25/200 RRY LLP		EXAMINER	
26 WEST 61ST STREET			ARBES, CARL J	
NEW YORK, NY 10023			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3729	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/585,476	BAUER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	C. J. Arbes	3729		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ju     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This     Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.			
Disposition of Claims				
4)  Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-27 is/are withdrav 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o  Application Papers 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and accomposition of the propers are subjected to by the Examine 10.  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition to the	vn from consideration. r election requirement. er. epted or b) □ objected to by the B			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	tammer. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <a href="https://example.com/html/profession/">https://example.com/html/profession/</a>	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ate		

Applicants' traversal of the ofic3e's restriction has been duly noted. The traversal is held to be not sufficient to overcome the Office's Restriction. That is using the same Noble metal on the conductor base does not satisfy the general inventive concept standard with respect to these 2 different sets of claims. The Office continues to hold that the Office's Restriction is proper. In view of this holding the Restriction is now <a href="mailto:ma

An Office Action on the merits of claims 1-18 now follows.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. To the extent that Applicants have consistently used the term "characterized" in each of the claims 1-18 and the Examiner does not understand what Applicants intend by using this term it is held that the claims are unclear, vague and indefinite, Applicants will either carefully explain what they intend by using this term or in the alternative rewrite the claims using term which is commonly used in U.S. patent prosecution and is understandable.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

<sup>(</sup>a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikado et al (Pat No. 6,242,079 B1); hereinafter Mikado et al.. Mikado et al teach a method of making a multi-layered printed wiring board that includes an underlayer conductor circuit (26), an upper layer conductor circuit (44) formed on an interlaminar insulating layer (37) and a via hole (51) connecting the underlayer to the upper layer conductor circuit (44). (Cf. Abstract) The circuit board has a roughened surface (35) by treating the underlayer conductor circuit 24 with an etching solution. Good connection reliability results. Mikado et al also teach using a metal such as Titanium, Aluminum, Zinc, Iron, Indium, Thallium, Cobalt, Nickel, Tin or a noble metal such that the via hole conductor is not disturbed (Cf. Col 12). The thickness of this metal layer ranges between 0.01-5 microns. (Cf. Col 12) Mikado et al also teach forming wiring layers on both major sides of a core board as well as a through hole in the core board. (Cf. Col 17). After the surface of the interlamnar resin is roughened it can be electrolessly plated. A noble metal ion can be applied to the roughened surface (Cf. Col 18) Thereafter a thin electroless plated film is formed on the entire surface roughened surface on which the catylyst nucleus (of noble metal) has been deposited (Cf. Col 18) The thickness of this electrolessly plated metal e.g. Copper can range between 1-5 microns. A photosensitive resin is laminated on the electrolessly plated film. The photosensitive film is subjected to light exposure and developed to provide a circuit pattern. Thereafter an electrolytic film is formed on the electrolessly formed film (Cf. Col. 19) The electrolytic Copper film's thickness ranges from 10-20 microns. It would have been obvious to provide that the noble metal colloid e.g. Palladium be rough (if in

Art Unit: 3729

fact Mikado et al do not explicitly teach this limitation) inasmuch this roughness feature would provide better adherence whenever additional layers were placed onto the noble metal layer. As applied to claims 2, it is held that this limitation is within the ordinary skill of a PHOSITA and hence is given little or no patentable weight., As applied to claims 4-6, Mikado et al teach using a chemical etching means to roughen the underlayer conductor layer. The use of (a) ionic etching or (b) mechanical processing is held to be within the skill of an artisan given the Mikado et al teaching and therefore merits little of no patentable weight. As applied to claim 7 it is held that the thickness of the noble layer which Applicants claim compared with that taught by Mikado et al would have been obvious to a PHOSITA. Alternatively the range of thicknesses of the noble layer (recited in claim 7) is held to be design choice inasmuch as there is no particular purpose enunciated therefore nor is there any specific problem that is solved thereby. As applied to claim 9-11 inasmuch as Mikato et al teach using an electroless method of applying the noble metal layer it is held to within the ordinary skill of a PHOSITA to use instead, an electroplating or a cathodic evaporation or a sputtering method to apply the noble metal to the conductor layer inasmuch as these last 3 methods are conventional in this art.

Claims 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikado et al in view of Hunt et al (Pat No. 6,500,350 B1); hereinafter Hunt et al.

The teaching of Mikado et al has been described above and is not repeated.

Hunt et al teach the formation of thin film resistors embedded in printed circuit boards.

Resistive materials that can be used are platinum, silica and alumina (Cf. Col 5) The

resistive material can be deposited by means of combustion chemical vapor deposition (CCVD) Exposed and developed photoresist can be used to form discrete patches of resistive material. The resitive material can be deposited onto metal e.g. copper foil. (Cf. Col 6) It would have been obvious to combine the 2 teaching and to provide resistors onto the wiring board taught by Mikado et al inasmuch as this would give utility to the board. Moreover it would be within the ordinary skill of this art for a PHOSITA to try to create a wirting board having printed resistors on the wiring board layers.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. J. Arbes whose telephone number is 571-272-4563. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, R and F from 8 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Vo, can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/585,476 Page 6

Art Unit: 3729

/C. J. Arbes/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729